

NEWS RELEASE
PLEASE NOTE DATE



DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS
Washington 25, D.C.

60-8064
1134-60

ADDRESS BY GENERAL NATHAN F. TWINING
BEFORE THE NATIONAL SECURITY INDUSTRIAL ASSOCIATION
WEDNESDAY, September 28, 1960

Waldorf Astoria, NYC, 8:30 p.m.

THE DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT OF NATIONAL POLICY

INTRODUCTION

Ad Lib

Tonight, I am here, as a military man, to tell you something about the American prospects in the world struggle against communism. Knowing what I do, I could not in simple honesty start out by assuring you that our future freedom and well-being is guaranteed. After all, we've had Mr. K and his cronies on our front doorstep for the past week, and it's plain they can stir up plenty of trouble whenever they choose to do so. All the same, things are not nearly as bad as some of our favorite prophets of doom would have us believe. The facts simply do not justify despair. The United States is not becoming a second class nation. It is not falling behind in the race for new means of national power. You have every reason to be confident of American strength. Sure, we are being pressed somewhat, and there are dangers about us. But when has this not been so?

Today there are more things right than wrong and the problem before us is to make sure that the rightness of things remains. The kind of struggle we are in - a struggle not alone of power - but of faith and the rule of law against materialism and moral anarchy - makes no allowance for a graceful loser. Either we win or we are finished. But this is no basis for hysteria. As a nation, we have learned to be fairly calm. We can be generous to others. But we are not given to putting a good face on defeat. We expect our leadership, without excessive prodding from the citizenry, to look after the national interest, and that means attending to the many aspects of our well-being - including our military strength.

Accordingly, as a military representative of that leadership, I am going to discuss four topics:

First: The threat to our security.

Approved For Release 2003/02/27 : CIA-RDP80B01676R0009000500244

Second: The need for our being toughminded in matters that count.

Third: Some responsibilities of business leadership in the world struggle, and

Fourth: The condition of our Armed Forces.

THE THREAT:

As to my first topic, the threat, we Americans may disagree as to the magnitude of the communist threat in one particular or another. But we are generally agreed on the central fact of that threat. It is the most serious challenge yet to be directed at us in all our history.

The challenge is reaching across the entire spectrum of organized human effort. The contest for military and political advantage is widening into a race for dominance in the cold reaches of outer space; for superiority in fundamental disciplines of science; for the resources and markets of the world. The Russians have hit the moon with a rocket, but their crude oil is also moving into the markets of India at cut-throat prices, and their jets, until recently were hauling communist agents into the Congo. The strategic end sought by the Sino-Soviet bloc is to drive American influence back upon our own continent, to isolate this nation from allies and the outer resources, and to shatter the pattern of free societies and the flow of trade based on the principle of mutual advantage. All these sides of the threat must be met, but our power of maneuver depends on our having a protecting shield of decisive military power.

So the threat is a broad one, and the pressure on us is intensifying everywhere. However, this is not to say that any immediate catastrophe is upon us. Most authorities in international affairs have come to this conclusion. Rather, we appear to face a period of prolonged crisis, or a succession of crises. This condition could last for years. It will go on until there is a clear winner and a clear loser. The struggle is too big, too vast, too deadly for compromise.

THE NEED FOR BEING TOUGHMINDED

A man engaged in this kind of serious business has to be toughminded - which is the second and major topic on which I would like to comment.

Because the stakes are vital, we shall undoubtedly encounter situations in which the United States will have to follow courses that are momentarily or superficially unpopular - both at home and abroad. No nation in history has ever been more conscientious, more diligent, and more tolerant than has the United States in fostering alliances aimed at serving the common interest of many nations. We have done this while preserving the traditional source of

the common actions of the Free World in opposing the pressures of communism. Yet, the fact remains that it is American power and American resources that provide these associations with ribs of steel, and it is also a fact that the ultimate objective of the Sino-Soviet drive for power is the destruction of the American central position.

Let us, by all means, invigorate and deepen the meaning of our alliances. There can be no thought of our pulling back into a policy of isolation, or of our retreating into a "Fortress America." It is our obligation - perhaps even history will record that it was our great destiny - to defend and uphold among the small nations the principles and traditions of free society through the great upheavals of the Twentieth Century. Anything that we can do to promote a unity of purpose and a unity of effort among our many allies is all to the good, their good as well as our own. But let us not forget, either, that alliances cannot be perfect instruments. Care must be exercised that the capacity of the more powerful member, for independent and perhaps decisive action is not lost. Therefore, within the framework of free nations, we must be careful that we do not yield to friendly pressures which would eventually pull the strength and determination of the United States down to the level of a lowest common denominator. No free Nation will benefit in the long run if we lose the capacity for unilateral action in our own security interests - no free Nation would long remain free if the strength and determination of the United States were allowed to be weakened.

Hence the need for our being toughminded. In the relations of nations, as in human relations, it sometimes takes more courage to be firm with a friend than with an enemy. Our alliances, by and large, have not yet achieved anything like their full potential for common action in the agreed general interest. If the margin of risk is to remain tolerable, those nations which can must do more, and those nations which would resist communism in their own area - but would tolerate encroachment in other areas - should adopt a broader perspective.

In a word, we must be stricter with our friends and with ourselves. There have been times, in recent years, when it seemed to me that some of our people in positions of influence had ceased to understand precisely the objectives of American policy. In saying this, I am well aware, as you are, that the caliber of our Federal representation abroad, whether military or civilian, has greatly improved. By and large, our representatives are better informed; they are more at home in foreign languages. But, I can't help but wish that our educational processes had also inspired a stronger faith in American values, and the resolution and the guts and fortitude to maintain them. When one is charged with defending the nation's interest,

and when that interest is reasonable and moral, what is so awful about being unpopular? The people we send abroad to represent us should not be judged by how well they get along with others, although that is certainly important. They should be judged primarily on how tenaciously they defend the American interest. Being loved is an unreliable alternative for a foreign policy. It is enough to be respected, in the best meaning of that word.

In summary, my point is this: We have a right and proper national purpose, a proud history, and a continuing opportunity to defend ourselves against our avowed enemies. These things call for apology to no one. An American may rightly be impatient at our failure to have accomplished more, but historically, the American has been proud of what this country has done and is prepared to do. Let us hold fast to that faith, and make sure that those who represent us at home and abroad are of the same mind.

RESPONSIBILITIES AND BUSINESS LEADERSHIP

This leads me to my third topic - the responsibilities, as I see them, of business leadership in our complex world situation.

Policies and decisions of our leadership, affecting friend and foe alike, are not easy to come by. There are so many pressures from within that it is sometimes difficult to determine the actual attitude and will of the vast body of the American people. The toughmindedness which is required of our military and political leaders must be based on the conviction of our leadership that we are truly toughminded as a nation and that we, as a people, will support firm policies - economic - political - or military - even though these policies may be financially costly or contain elements of danger.

It has been my observation that bureaucracies, whether military or civilian, are incapable, at the middle layers, of generating risky or unpopular policies. Drive can be imposed from the top, or it can be forced from the outside. But the deep-rooted echelons in the middle layers of government instinctively shun courses that involve risk or may be unpopular.

In a very real sense, the fate of the democratic system rests with its responsible citizens. It is citizens like you who must in the end decide what the Government ought to do, what options it should exercise. The best of leadership will be left hamstrung if its decisions fail to arouse the support of a public opinion that has neglected to keep itself properly informed. I have myself witnessed hard and good decisions subjected to merciless and wanton attack, and I know the loneliness that can envelop leadership under such circumstances. And I have seen, in the absence of a clear and forthright expression of the public will, good policies gradually diluted and undermined

in the middle levels of government by hacks and fumbler who shrink from actions that might come under criticism from certain quarters.

Who, after all, is to decide what is unpopular? The citizens, of course. And here, it seems to me, we owe it to ourselves to do a certain amount of personal stocktaking. Not long ago, I was shocked to hear a highly-placed intelligent citizen argue that the American people could not be depended upon to assert world leadership. We had become - and I am quoting him - "status quo" people, people concerned, first of all, with conserving what we have; with fighting at best a rear-guard action to maintain our material comforts. There we are, by this expert's definition - all drive gone, just fat, dumb, and happy.

I refuse to go along with that. If that is an image of America, I fail to recognize it - possibly because I was brought up in the West Point tradition of Duty, Honor, Country. Unfortunately, however, I feel that many people have developed doubts and apprehensions as to national character. And so I say that the time is at hand for American citizens to start figuring out with great care where they stand on a number of critical issues, and to assert their views in the old-fashioned way. I shall mention three items on which the stocktaking could well start.

One item is the question of nuclear testing. Here is a matter of the utmost importance to our national and personal future. Look into the facts relating to fall-out, and decide for yourself how much that danger has been exaggerated. Take a careful reading of the relative power positions a few years hence, should a ban on testing continue indefinitely without reasonable safeguards. Then let your political leaders and your newspapers know where you stand.

Another item is disarmament. We all want disarmament with proper safeguards. Yet there are many people, undoubtedly sincere, who are convinced that armaments are the cause of world tensions and that these tensions would disappear if armaments were abolished. These same people would be horrified at the thought of abolishing the New York police force while hoodlums and footpads were still loose. However, in the dream world in which they live, they fail to see that some nations are in fact headed by gangsters and hoodlums and only await the opportunity to catch us with our guard down - in the same manner as a criminal yokes a law-abiding citizen on a darkened street.

Unfortunately, the minority which favors disarmament without proper controls makes more noise than the great majority who do not. All of you, as responsible citizens, might make more noise - and let the press and your

government know that you understand that world tensions are the causes of armaments - not the reverse - and that any meaningful disarmament can only follow - not precede - political reconciliation.

Another item concerns the traditional principle of freedom-of-the-seas. Recently, one of our reconnaissance aircraft, an RB-47, was shot down by the Soviet Union over international waters. In this act of lawlessness, four American officers were murdered; the two surviving officers are being wrongfully detained in the Soviet Union. The crew were all in uniform; they were on a legitimate and legal errand in their country's interest. Yet they are locked up and denied the rights that law-respecting nations accord. Still, there are among us some who say our people had no business being where they were; who argue that the freedom-of-the-seas principle is no longer appropriate. Well, your government doesn't believe that, and its hand would be strengthened if you and your neighbors spoke up to say how mistaken those others are.

I am not proposing that you give your government blind and unqualified support. Criticize it if you will, but if you believe it is doing the right thing, and when what you judge to be the right thing falls under relentless attack from those whom you consider irresponsible or misguided, then move forward in its support, or the good thing may be defeated in detail.

For example - in all my experience in Washington, I have never seen anything more unjust or more destructive of the national interest, than the attack on the policies and character of the late John Foster Dulles. He was damned as "Mr. Inflexible." But was his sternness, his concern for ethics, so wrong? He was firm in resisting any erosion of the power and prestige of the United States. He stood firm against communism. Therefore, he was inflexible. We are the poorer for his going. Had he received in office, in the midst of the attack upon him, the popular support which I am sure was innately his, the outlook of thousands in government who today assist in policy-making would be as unflinching as was his.

So far, I have talked about the responsibilities of the businessman as a citizen. But now I propose to discuss the role of business leadership as an element in national strategy.

What I have to say will not surprise you. Being familiar with world markets, you know what you are up against. You are competing against the monolithic effort of the Soviet Union. You are also competing with the industries of our political partners, whose vigorous return to the market place was greatly helped by our generous assistance after the war. As you

fare, so will the nation, for while the American capacity for action in the world depends upon many different kinds of strength, the strength central to the rest is economic, which is to say the products and policies that flow from work.

Soviet industry operates as one gigantic trust. It fixes wages and prices arbitrarily. The product of labor goes entirely to the State, which can direct its labor and capital to whatever purpose is most advantageous - for subversion, for sputniks, or for waging economic war on the West. In the 1930's, the Soviet Union sold grain at prices below an already depressed world market, and this at a time when millions of Russian peasants were starving. Now the Russians have penetrated and are trying to capture the markets and resources of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Khrushchev has boasted that the Communists will fill the needs of backward peoples better than we can. What he really means is that communism expects to come thereby into control of much of the world's vital resources and markets. That is the real meaning of their activities in Guinea, the Congo, Cuba, and more countries whose names have yet to leap into the headlines.

Things are likely to get tough all over - for business and for American policies generally. Western oil companies are running into rough competition now in Pakistan and India and even in Chile, where the Russians offer to lay down oil at \$12 a ton, or about half the delivered price of Soviet oil to Bulgaria.

You can meet your side of the threat and win, but let no one think it's going to be a long coast home. If American business means to hold its own in the world markets, it is going to have to increase its productivity, in order to meet the price lists of the new competition. Your sales managers and personnel directors will have to pay more attention to the language skills and training of their overseas representatives. You will have to improve your servicing methods.

You are also going to face research and development problems of staggering complexity. The horizons which used to confine man's intellect are literally exploding outward into the universe. The new technology and the basic sciences and knowledge on which these technologies depend are as important to our strategy as they are to business. The sums spent by the Defense Department for basic and applied research and your own investment in these areas will have a direct bearing on how successfully the nation meets the challenge of communism. For the test is not alone one of power. It is also a test of intelligence, of will and of endurance.

ARMED FORCES

Now for my final topic - the state of the Armed Forces. Here, because you have had many service briefings and are familiar with our weapon systems, and the broad lines of American strategy, I shall limit myself to several generalizations.

We may reasonably expect the future development of our military power to follow lines that will keep our forces provided with a wide choice of weapons for all likely emergencies and that will also maintain them on a footing that can be sustained for as long as the crisis lasts. Readiness, flexibility and staying power - these are the governing considerations.

Our national objective must remain clear. It is to develop and hold power sufficient to win in all aspects of military struggle, all-out or limited. Concerning all-out war, we now have a powerful "mix" of deterrent forces. These forces can also be applied to limited war situations. They are flexible, they command a wide choice of means and they have staying power. We must keep the deterrent on that basis. Nothing less will do. I cannot hammer home this point too strongly. We can now destroy Russia, and China if we are attacked, and the Communist leaders know it. They know that even if they launched a surprise attack, they would bring down certain destruction on their own heads. A nuclear world is not a comfortable world, but it is preferable, in my thinking, to a communized world. The American capability for decisive, war-winning response to any attack must be kept sure, whatever the costs. It is the only reliable guarantee of the peace. Forces that cannot win will not deter.

We must be braced for limited wars fought for limited objectives - but the American objectives should never countenance stalemate or defeat, nor the erosion of our national power or interest through inconclusive action. All of our forces must be maintained on a basis that will allow them to do their job. Here, readiness at all times and logistics are the keys to successful action. We are battle-ready now, and logistics is a field in which we have always excelled. We must keep that advantage because it is the factor that will regulate our ability to use our forces effectively. We have worked hard on solving the problem of moving forces and equipment across the seas at the utmost speed. A good system of overseas bases and stockpiles has come into being, and while our airlift stands in need of modernization, the American techniques for projecting power rapidly across great distances are unequalled. The Russians are not in the same class, and we must keep this advantage.

The forces in being and the forces coming along, are, in my judgment, of the right mix. There can be no serious question of the national capacity to maintain the proper balance of forces in the years ahead. We may have to tighten our belts a notch, but this would scarcely be a national disaster. Our position right now is a strong one and it can be maintained indefinitely if the national will remains strong. But I repeat what I said earlier - we cannot gamble on what form military conflict might take. We must at all times place our military emphasis on the clear, unequivocal US ability to destroy Russia, and China if we are attacked. That is the best deterrent to all forms of communist aggression.

CONCLUSION

As I leave office, my confidence in the traditions, the faith, and the purposes of the American people is as strong as it was the day I went off to West Point. There are problems, there are dangers, but they are, at worst, only different kinds of problems and different kinds of dangers. Your place in the American scheme of things, as businessmen-citizens, has long been central to our strength. I shall be watching you bring to the challenge of the day the boldness and intelligence that the rest of us expect from American business.

As to my own future, it is not easy to put aside the uniform, I have worn for forty four years. Will I be satisfied to sit on the sidelines while the rest of you continue the battle? During long years of public service the distinction between duty and private satisfaction tends to disappear. One makes the other, and I therefore expect that for me, as for all executives when the time comes to empty the briefcase and close out the files, the adjustment may present its difficulties. However, many before me have worked this out, and I am sure that I can too.